

**Minutes of the  
Waterfront Advisory Committee  
July 21, 2015**

Present: Charlie Kane, Chairman  
Ann Gallelli  
Bruce Kauderer  
Andy Levitt

Absent: Stuart Greenbaum

**1. Charlie Kane called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.**

**2. REFERRALS**

*a) Village Board referral of Local Law Introductory 8 of 2015 amending Chapter 225, to streamline procedures for obtaining consistency review with Village's Local Waterfront Revitalization Program—preliminary consistency review*

Ms. Gallelli stated that draft law's intent is to streamline the process from two reviews to one review. Mr. Kauderer noted that the Planning Board had discussed this draft law at a recent Planning Board meeting and they had found it particularly beneficial to the applicant.

In a review of the Coastal Assessment Form, Mr. Kauderer questioned why on p. 4, #4, there were YES answers, and stated he thought they all should be left unanswered since they were not applicable. The other board members concurred that the YES answers did not seem applicable and recommended that all the answers in on p. 4, Section #4 in the CAF be left unanswered. Therefore, it is recommended that in the Note section written above #4 include the text that is in bold: "This section is designed for site-specific actions rather than area-wide or generic proposals. The answers to the questions reflect the fact that the proposed Village Code revisions would apply to **future actions in the coastal zone area**. However, no construction is proposed, nor any anticipated to directly result from the proposed revisions. **Therefore, this whole section is not applicable.**"

On page 5 of 1.1 Project Description, Mr. Kauderer noted there was a typographical error in the spelling of the word "definition."

In a review of the EAF, p. 2 of 13, B (b), the WAC recommends that NO be checked not YES and that the Agency Waterfront Advisory Committee be moved to B (d) in the category of "Other local agencies."

In reviewing the EAF, part II, p. 6, #9 should say NO, because there is no building or development occurring. On p. 6 of the EAF, part II, #10, the answer should say NO, not YES, since there is no impact to a historic or archaeological resource; on p. 9, #16, the answer

should say NO, not YES, because there is no impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants.

In a review of the LWRP policies, the only policy that is applicable to this draft law is policy 1A:

*Existing planning and zoning documents should be reviewed and amended where necessary to ensure development within the community is consistent with adopted goals and policies.*

The proposed draft law is consistent with this policy because by modifying the process to create more efficiency, development is ensured. The proposed change in the law is applicable because it reduces the number of reviews to one instead of two, and therefore the applicant will benefit because the process is more efficient and less time consuming.

It was noted that all the LWRP policies might be applicable and consistent when the LWRP is modified, however, for this draft law, policy 1A is the only applicable policy.

Chairman Kane shared some of his initial thoughts regarding possible changes in the LWRP policies, although he acknowledged that these would be addressed individually at a different meeting when the LWRP is reviewed.

Mr. Kauderer made a motion to make a recommendation of preliminary consistency, seconded by Ms. Gallelli, and carried, all in favor, by a vote of 4-0.

### **3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Ms. Gallelli made a motion to approve the minutes of June 10, 2015, seconded by Mr. Levitt and carried all in favor by a vote of 4-0.

### **4. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Levitt made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Kauderer, and carried all in favor by a vote of 4-0. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronnie L. Rose  
Secretary to the WAC